

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/663,378	Applicant(s) ROGERS, STEVEN A.	
	Examiner HABTE MERED	Art Unit 2416	

All Participants:

(1) HABTE MERED.

(2) Bradley C. Wright (38,061).

Date of Interview: 13 March 2009

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
N/A

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner brought to the attention of Applicant's Attorney that the US Patent 7, 468, 948 also owned by the Applicant poses double patenting issues with the claims of the instant Application and terminal disclaimer will be required. Applicant after listening to Examiner's position indicated that the US Patent 7, 468, 948 is a continuation in part of the instant Application and is issued prior to the instant Application and based on MPEP 804.1 (b) requires two-way obviousness test. Further Applicant indicated that the claims of US Patent 7, 468, 948 are directed only to the new disclosure found in the Patent's specification. Examiner after carefully reviewing Applicant's position concurred with the Applicant that there is no double patenting issue given the fact that the patented case never claims timeslot or discloses timeslots in the specification and the claimed time intervals or time locations are not necessarily cyclic or periodic and significantly differ from the definition of timeslot in the art.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Aung S. Moe/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

